NoName Group Evaluation Criteria July 17, 1998

- Consistent with CALFED Is it consistent with CALFED's long-term goals? Would it be retained (+) or abandoned (-) later. Is it in harmony (+) or does it conflict (-) with CALFED's long-term goals. Stranded costs are small (+) / large (-).
 - + very consistent, compatible with programs, or part of a long-term project
 - neutral, neither strongly consistent nor inconsistent, or partly consistent, partly inconsistent (needs explanation - such as consistent, but would be superseded).
 - inconsistent, conflicts with CALFED, or would be abandoned.
- 2. Stakeholder support (explain)
- 3. Assurances potential Does implementation allow for uncertainty in use (-)? Does it require assurances to guarantee extensive mitigation or other projects to offset impacts (-)? Is it self-limiting (+)? (i.e. Is it for a limited and defined amount that cannot be circumvented?)
 - + self-limiting, few assurances needed
 - o some assurances needed (explain)
 - extensive or difficult assurances needed
- 4. Availability of funding.
 - + Funding is identified and available immediately.
 - o Funding sources are likely, but not assured or are conditioned.
 - ? Funding not known.
 - Funding not available, likely to be difficult or a problem.
- Cost Total capital, O&M and mitigation costs, costs per acre-foot (quantitative, when possible).
- 6. Implementability Does it require extensive review and permitting by multiple agencies, and/or purchase of extensive rights-of-way from numerous entities (-)? Are there significant problems or obstacles to implementation (-)?
 - + Few permits, or permits already obtained, few or no obstacles.
 - o Some permits, obstacles, but likely to move forward on schedule (explain).
 - Many obstacles, permits, probably difficult implementation.
- 7. Time frame of implementation (e.g., immediate, 1-3 yrs, 3-5 yrs, ...)

- 8. Mitigation Potential How much mitigation is needed? Does it require projects that offset impacts (-)? Are there likely to be secondary impacts that could stop the project because mitigation is difficult or impossible (-)? Does it provide mitigation for other actions (e.g., as a secondary purpose)?
 - + Self-mitigating, none need or easily done; provides secondary mitigation (explain).
 - o Needs mitigation or projects, but they are feasible and likely to be carried out (explain).
 - Extensive mitigation, problematic in one or more areas.
- Environmental benefits other than water supply. Does it provide environmental benefits other than water supply (+)? Examples: timing of diversions, fish or wildlife benefits (direct or indirect), flexibility.
 - + Definite benefits.
 - o Possible benefits or neutral.
 - No benefits likely, requires mitigation.
- Water supply benefits quantify (volume per year, rate of diversion, yield or maximum volume).
- 11. Water quality benefits Does it provide water quality benefits to beneficial uses?
 - + Provides definite benefits to some or many uses.
 - o May provide benefits, depends on how it is operated (explain).
 - No benefits, likely to hinder water quality improvements, needs mitigation.
- 12. Environmental impacts Does it avoid impacts (+) or produce significant impacts (-)? Does it require significant mitigation (-)?
 - + Impacts avoided or are minimal.
 - Requires mitigation, but mitigation is likely or depends on how the project is operated (explain).
 - Mitigation is required and problematic.
- 13. Water supply impacts Does it have impacts on some users (-)? Does it require mitigation (-)?
 - + No impacts or minimal impacts.
 - Some impacts, but they can be mitigated or they depend on how the project is operated (explain).
 - Extensive impacts or impacts that are difficult to mitigate.

- 14. Water quality impacts Does it have impacts on some beneficial users (-)? Are mitigation measures or offsetting projects required (-)?

 - No impacts or minimal impacts.
 Some impacts, but they can be mitigated (explain).
 Extensive impacts or impacts that are difficult to mitigate.
- 15. Unresolved issues (list).